

REMARKS

The status of the claims are as follows: Claims 1-11 and 13-20 remain in the Application. Claims 12 and 21 have been canceled without prejudice.

The Examiner's objection to the drawings shown in FIGS. 1-3 is hereby acknowledged. Replacement drawing sheets are submitted herewith.

The Examiner has objected to Claims 12, 14-15 and 21 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. The claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 1-7, 13 and 16-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,400,100, which issued to Kramer.

In an effort to expedite prosecution, Claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations of dependent Claim 12 (now canceled). Claims 2-11 depend from amended Claim 1. Also, Claim 13 has been amended to include the limitations of dependent Claim 21 (now canceled). Claims 14-20 depend from amended Claim 13.


Claims 8-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. The Examiner objects to Applicant's use of the term "about" in Claims 8 and 10. Claims 9 and 11 are rejected because they depend from Claims 8 and 10, respectively. The rejection of Claims 8-11 is respectfully traversed and reconsideration thereof is requested.

The Examiner's attention is respectfully directed to MPEP § 2173.05 which states that "[t]he fact that claim language, including terms of degree, may not be precise, does not automatically render the claim indefinite under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph." In fact, this section of the MPEP provides examples wherein the actual term "about" was held to be clear or definite. Applicant submits that one of ordinary skill in the art would understand what is claimed in light of the specification. In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 8-11 are not indefinite under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. Withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph is earnestly and respectfully requested.

The remaining cited art has been examined, but is not considered more pertinent to patentability than the art discussed above.

The Application with Claims 1-11 and 13-20 is deemed in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully urged. Should the Examiner believe that minor differences exist which, if overcome, would pass the Application to allowance and that said differences can be discussed in a phone conversation, the Examiner is respectfully requested to phone the undersigned at the number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Carlo S. Bessone".

Carlo S. Bessone

Reg. No. 30,547

OSRAM SYLVANIA INC.  
100 Endicott Street  
Danvers, MA 01923  
(978) 750-2076

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

The attached sheets of drawings each marked "Replacement Sheet" includes changes to FIGS. 1-3. These sheets replace the original sheets including FIGS. 1-3.